



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Crozier, instead of reprinting this group of essays, had rewritten their substance, cutting out those passages in which he repeats himself or in which he has been proved by the course of events to be mistaken, the book need not have been half as long. As it is, the judicious reader will be obliged to make for himself those excisions which should have been made by the author.

It does not follow that the book is not worth reading. Dr. Crozier is a man of salient intellectual individuality. He began many years ago to build up a philosophy of social progress; and the several books which he has published as parts of his general scheme have all contained vigorous and independent thinking. He has made a genuine personal contribution to the discussion of our contemporary social problems and their historical background. But his thinking has always been more spasmodic and energetic than systematic and careful. He is sometimes betrayed by the liveliness of his imagination and the intolerance of his independence; and in dealing with economic questions he seems peculiarly liable to such betrayal. His *Wheel of Wealth* was not much more than an ingenious effort to base a system of economics on a metaphor. His discussion of tariff reform in the present book is an illustration of the same kind of insistent imaginative credulity; it adds little to what he has already published in support of high protectionism. On the other hand, these essays, as well as those on certain phases of socialism, contain much shrewd and penetrating comment on the human aspects of modern social and economic questions. Dr. Crozier is not always sound, but he is usually interesting; and if he is less interesting than usual in this particular book that is because of the occasional and fragmentary nature of much of its contents.

HERBERT CROLY.

*Abriss einer Geschichte der Theorie von den Produktionsfaktoren.*

By JOHANNES MÜLLER. (Jena: Gustav Fischer. 1911.  
Pp. 53. 1.80 m.)

This rather fragmentary sketch passes in rapid review the theories of Turgot, Smith, Mill, Sismondi, List, Robertus, Marx, and Brentano concerning production and the factors of production; and includes scattered comments on value and distribution. It is of small value to anyone who is familiar with the history of economics, and misleading to one who is not. Though showing

clear evidence of immaturity, it is rather dogmatical in tone. The contributions of the Mercantilists and Kameralists are denied by implication, and no mention is made of Senior or Hermann. The reviewer would ask these questions: Did Smith introduce individualism? Is it true that Turgot did not, on the whole, recognize the productivity of capital? Was Mill the first to recognize and expound the relation of scarcity to value? Did he make the "secondary factors" (climate, security, etc.) in any way co-ordinate with land, labor, and capital? These queries seem to deserve a negation, and each negation is a criticism of the *Abriss*.

One point of importance is suggested by the persual of Dr. Müller's pamphlet: Does the writer not fail to see that Smith's definition of "production" is a question of definition? The problem with the classical economists was to define "wealth" so as to make it a measurable quantum and then to define "production" so as to correlate it with wealth. This is a problem today. To choose a definition of wealth which includes invisible and intangible items, as does the author, merely indicates that he has a different—and perhaps a less precise—notion of the scope of the science.

LEWIS H. HANEY.

*University of Texas.*

#### NEW BOOKS

D'AMBROSIO, M. *Passivité économique*. Paris: Giard et Brière. 1911. 9 fr.)

ARIAS, G. *La sintesi economica*. (Torino: Fratelli Bocca Editori. 1911. Pp. 49.)

To be reviewed.

ASTURARO, A. *Sociologia politica*. (Genoa: Casa edit. & Ten. 1911.)

BOUGLE, C. C. A. *La sociologie de Proudhon*. (Paris: Colin. 1911. Pp. xviii, 333. 3.50 fr.)

DIBBLEE, G. B. *The laws of supply and demand. With special reference to their influence on overproduction and unemployment*. (London: Constable.)

EUCKEN, R. *Life's basis and life's ideal*. Translated by A. C. WIDGERY. (London: Black. 1911.)

FELDER, E. *Der Wert im Gesetze*. (Innsbruck: Wagner. 1912. Pp. viii, 165. 4 m.)

FONTAINE, T. *Sommaire de l'économie politique*. (Brussels: Féron, 1911. Pp. 112. 2 fr.)